

Please add Claims 22 and 23 as follows:

*Ab
cancel*

~~22. The recording medium according to claim 20,
wherein said second direction is substantially 180° different
from the first direction.~~

~~23. The recording medium according to claim 21,
wherein said second direction is substantially 180° different
from the first direction.~~

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Submitted concurrently herewith is a Request for Approval to Amend the Drawings, seeking the Draftsperson's approval to add the legend "PRIOR ART" to Figs. 1 and 2, as the Examiner requested.

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 6, 10, 12, 17, 20, and 21 being independent.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-13, 17, 18, 20, and 21 have been amended and Claims 22 and 23 have been added.

Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

Initially, Applicants wish to point out that the correct filing date of the Japanese priority document for this application is December 3, 1997, rather than March 12, 1997. The correct date for the priority application is set forth in the original inventors' declaration in (day/month/year) format as 3/12/1997. The correct date of December 3, 1997 is also indicated in the Claim For Priority filed on August 10, 1998, and on the cover page of the certified priority document submitted with the Claim For Priority. Applicants note that the official Filing Receipt lists the incorrect date for the priority application, and therefore a Request for Corrected Filing Receipt is being submitted concurrently herewith to obtain correction.

Since the correct filing date for the priority application is actually December 3, 1997, the U.S. application was filed within 12 months of the priority application and the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 is proper.

Claims 11, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants submit that the amendments to those claims overcome the Examiner's objections, and therefore Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of that rejection.

Claims 1-5, 10-16, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Lanckton, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in Claims 1 and 12, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the feature wherein first and second image sensing means are separated a known distance and first and second image data are sensed at different times from each other, wherein the time difference corresponds to the known distance. As recited in Claims 10 and 20, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the feature wherein first image data and second image data are associated based on time duration information that corresponds to the known distance separating first and second image sensing means. Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least these features.

Lanckton, et al. discloses an advanced terrain mapping system that utilizes a plurality of cameras located on a vehicle. The vehicle comprises a tractor 4 and trailer 6 on which three front cameras and three rear cameras are installed. The system takes two stereoscopic images using two pairs of cameras, one of which is located at the left side and another is at the right side of the vehicle. The

system uses those images to develop an orthographic database image.

However, Lanckton, et al. does not disclose or suggest the feature recited in Claims 1 and 12 wherein first and second image sensing means are separated a known distance and first and second image data are sensed at different times from each other, with the time difference corresponding to the known distance. Nor does that patent disclose or suggest the feature recited in Claims 10 and 20 wherein first image data and second image data are associated based on time duration information that corresponds to the known distance separating first and second image sensing means. Lanckton, et al. is silent regarding any use of a time difference information between image data.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present invention recited in Claims 1, 10, 12, and 20 is patentable over Lanckton, et al.

Claims 6-9, 17-19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Lanckton, et al. considered in combination with Lachinski, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

As recited in Claims 6 and 17, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the feature similar to that of Claims 1 and 12 wherein first and second image data are sensed at different times from each other, with the time difference corresponding to the known distance between the means for sensing the first and second image data.

As discussed above, Lanckton, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned feature. Applicants submit that Lachinski, et al. likewise fails to disclose or suggest at least that feature, and therefore that patent fails to add anything to Lanckton, et al. that would render obvious the present invention. Lachinski, et al. discloses a system for collecting and processing visual and spatial position information for the formation of a geographic information database. That patent discloses a vehicle having a plurality of cameras 50, and further discloses selectively recording visual information from any one of four cameras in each frame according to a preset recording cycle. See Col. 6, line 64, to Col. 7, line 47. However, that patent is silent regarding any use of a time difference information between image data.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 6 and 17 are also patentable over the cited art, whether that art is considered individually or taken in combination.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11, 13-16, 18, and 19 recite additional features that further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Further individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/fdb